

David T. Biderman, Bar No. 101577
DBiderman@perkinscoie.com
Jasmine W. Wetherell, Bar No. 288835
JWetherell@perkinscoie.com
PERKINS COIE LLP
505 Howard Street, Suite 1000
San Francisco, CA 94105-3204
Telephone: 415.344.7000
Facsimile: 415.344.7050

Charles C. Sipos, *pro hac vice*
CSipos@perkinscoie.com
Lauren E. Staniar, *pro hac vice*
LStaniar@perkinscoie.com
PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Telephone: 206.359.8000
Facsimile: 206.359.9000

Attorneys for Defendant
Keurig Dr Pepper, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JOHN PELS, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

KEURIG DR PEPPER, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:19-cv-03052-SI

**KEURIG DR PEPPER, INC.'S NOTICE OF
REQUEST TO PERMIT MULTIPLE
ATTORNEYS TO ARGUE PENDING
MOTION TO DISMISS**

Date: October 17, 2019
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom: Courtroom 1, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

1 Undersigned counsel for Keurig Dr. Pepper, Inc. (“KDP”) hereby provides Notice of its
2 request that the Court permit multiple attorneys to conduct oral argument on KDP’s Motion to
3 Dismiss, set for hearing October 17, 2019. This request is made pursuant to the Northern
4 District’s Policy Encouraging Opportunities For Attorneys Who Are Less Experienced Or From
5 Under-Represented Groups.¹

6 The Policy “strongly encourages parties to provide opportunities for attorneys who are
7 less experienced or from historically under-represented groups to participate actively in the
8 proceedings such as by arguing a motion.” The Policy goes on to explain that “[a]ll Northern
9 District judges will consider permitting multiple lawyers to argue a motion for one party if it
10 would create an opportunity for less experienced attorneys to participate.”

11 KDP requests that the argument be divided between the undersigned counsel, Charles C.
12 Sipos, and co-counsel for KDP Lauren Watts Staniar. Ms. Staniar, who has appeared in the action
13 on behalf of KDP, has three years of experience in practice, so the request for divided argument is
14 made consistent with the Policy’s objectives.

15 With the Court’s permission, Ms. Staniar would present oral argument on the following
16 issues: Plaintiff’s Article III standing, mootness, and Plaintiff’s Article III standing to seek
17 injunctive relief. Mr. Sipos would argue the remaining issues presented in the pending Motion to
18 Dismiss: applicability of 21 C.F.R. § 165.110, federal preemption, and failure to state a claim.

19 Undersigned counsel for KDP has conferred with Plaintiff’s counsel, who do not object to
20 KDP dividing argument in this fashion.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ Available at: <https://cand.uscourts.gov/pages/1207>.

1 DATED: October 11, 2019

PERKINS COIE LLP

3 By: /s/ Charles C. Sipos

4 Charles C. Sipos, *pro hac vice*
CSipos@perkinscoie.com

5 *Attorney for Defendant*
6 *Keurig Dr Pepper, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on October 11, 2019, I caused to be filed via the CM/ECF system true and correct copies of the forgoing document and that the service of this document was accompanied on all parties in the case by CM/ECF system.

/s/ Charles C. Sipos

Charles C. Sipos, *pro hac vice*

CSipos@perkinscoie.com